

# THE ORIGINS OF THE SLAVONIC LITURGY

ANTONÍN DOSTÁL

This paper was given at the Symposium on "The Byzantine Mission to the Slavs: St. Cyril and St. Methodius," held at Dumbarton Oaks in May 1964.

THE arrival of the Byzantine mission in Great Moravia in 863, led by Constantine the Philosopher and his brother Methodius, was a turning point in the historical and cultural development of the Slavs. Ever since then the Slavs have had their own language and their own letters—the Glagolitic alphabet invented by Constantine which was replaced in the tenth century by the Cyrillic alphabet, and which is used to-day by the orthodox Slavs.<sup>1</sup> The Macedonian dialect,<sup>2</sup> which was spoken by the Slavs around Thessalonica<sup>3</sup> and which the two brothers knew well, remained the literary language of all

<sup>1</sup> Literature concerning the problem of the Byzantine mission is very extensive. I list, therefore, only some basic works: M. Weingart, "Bulhaři a Cařihrad před tisíciletím, List z dějin byzantských vlivů na osvětu slovanskou," *Výroč. zpráva gymnasia v Praze III* (Prague, 1915); F. Dvorník, *Les Slaves, Byzance et Rome au IX<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Travaux publiés par l'Institut slave IV (Paris, 1926); F. Grivec, *Konstantin und Method, Lehrer der Slaven* (Wiesbaden, 1960); Z. Dittrich, *Christianity in Great-Moravia*, Inst. XXXIII Bijdragen van Het (Groningen, 1962); P. Dutthieul, *L'Evangélisation des Slaves, Cyrille et Méthode* Bibliothèque de théologie, série 4, Hist. de la Théologie, V (Paris, 1963); F. Graus, "Velkomoravská říše, její postavení v současné Evropě a vnitřní struktura," *Konferencia o Vel'kej Morave a Byzantskej misii, Brno-Nitra 1-4, X* (1963), *Referáty* (Nitra, 1963); J. Poulik, "Archeologické objevy o Velké Moravě," *ibid.*; P. Ratkoš, "Východné oblasti Vel'kej Moravy a staré Maďari," *ibid.*; Vl. Vavřínek, "Staroslověnské životy Konstantina a Metoděje," *Rozpravy Českosl. akad. věd* (1963), seš. 17, roč. 73 (Prague, 1963).

<sup>2</sup> When speaking of the "Macedonian" dialect as the basis of Old Church Slavonic, we must think of it in terms of ninth-century geography and not in terms of the contemporary linguistic situation of Slavic languages in the Balkan area. In employing this term today, we refer to the language spoken by the Slavic population in the vicinity of Salonica and in Salonica itself, a language also well known to Constantine the Philosopher and his brother Methodius. This language was one of the southern group of Slavic languages, and though it is related historically to all Slavic languages, it is closest to present-day Bulgarian and Macedonian, if we disregard the principal changes (for instance, the loss of the declension, etc.) which took place during the development of these languages. Typical of these languages were consonantal groups, "št," "žd"; and, in addition to full vowels, two reduced vowels (the "jers"), nasal sounds, and a very broadly pronounced "ě." In words where the Russian group of Slavic languages has the so-called full pronunciation (cf. the Russian word "korol'"), this language uses the type "krals," and so on. Declension and conjugation were fully developed (the conjugation of verbs having the aorist and imperfect tenses as well as the perfect). The syntax of Old Church Slavonic had two especially characteristic constructions: the possessive and absolute datives. Originally only a spoken language, it was slightly adapted by Constantine for literary purposes and was strongly influenced in its syntax by Byzantine Greek. Constantine and Methodius knew the language perfectly, almost as well as their mother tongue, as extant documents prove. From this fact it is sometimes inferred that they were of Slavic nationality and origin (at least on their mother's side). This opinion cannot well be sustained. The explanation is that Constantine and Methodius were scholarly Byzantines educated in Graeco-Byzantine culture, whose education and activity were in many ways those of city dwellers in Constantinople, despite their birth in Salonica. (Compare, for example, the fact that even the oldest Slavonic alphabet, the so-called Glagolitic, has a pronouncedly Constantopolitan character.)

<sup>3</sup> This Slavonic language was spoken in the vicinity of Salonica. The Slavic language in that area, that is, what remains of it in modern times, is characterized by many archaisms and similarities to Old Church Slavonic. It may be assumed that at the time when both brothers were born and lived in Salonica, the town's inhabitants were bilingual to a considerable degree. Since the population of the adjacent countryside used to come to the town (to the marketplace, etc.), the townspeople, who were not of Slavic origin, out of necessity learned to understand them. It was therefore natural that many Greek, as well as Latin, words which were administrative, theological, military, economic, and so on, or, simply, terms reflecting the realities of Byzantine life could be found in the language of the Salonica Slavs. Terms borrowed from Byzantine Greek are often found in Old Church Slavonic texts, but this does not always mean that the Slavic expression was lacking, for Greek terms were current in the language of the non-Greek population.

the Slavs for several centuries. It is customary to call this common literary language "Slavonic" or "Church Slavonic," and the oldest version—that from the ninth to the eleventh century—"Old Church Slavonic."<sup>4</sup> All the works necessary to the cultural progress of the Slavs were written in this language.

These old Slavonic texts are preserved in manuscripts dating from and after the tenth century.<sup>5</sup> Many of them are copies of texts which originated in Great Moravia; others are of later date.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Slavic philologists attach great importance to the name of this old language, since it directly indicates the modern language related to the linguistic basis of the language used by the Salonian Slavs, Old Church Slavonic. The older school of Slavic philologists (Fr. Miklosich and others) was of the opinion that the basis of this language was the Slovenian (the so-called Pannonian theory.) This assumption was based on the fact that the ancient Old Church Slavonic manuscript which is written in Latin—the Freising Fragments—contains some obviously Slovenian elements. More recent research has reliably proven that the language spoken by the Salonian Slavs was the basis of the Old Church Slavonic (the Macedonian theory). This is the reason why this language was designated by certain more concrete terms (the German "*alibulgarisch*," for instance, introduced by August Leskien; the Bulgarian term, "*starobălgarski*," etc., in order to express the fact that Old Church Slavonic belonged to the Old Bulgarian language, and so on). Because of the important role this language had in the Orthodox Church, terms like "*Altkirchenslawisch*" were introduced; the Czech term "*staroslověština*," is similar to the French "*le vieux slave*" and suggests the ancient origin of this Slavonic language. Bulgarian Slavists call it simply, "old Bulgarian." This name, however, ties it too closely to the Bulgarian linguistic type and does not express its broader pan-Slavic importance. Moreover, this term creates difficulties with regard to the later development of the Bulgarian language itself in more recent periods. It would therefore be a mistake to connect this language with the notion of current linguistic differences in this area. The written Slavic language of the oldest period, approximately from the ninth to the eleventh century, is called Old Church Slavonic, whereas the language of the later period, beginning with the eleventh century, is called Church Slavonic. The more recent form of Old Church Slavonic, which penetrated from Great Moravia to other Slavs of other areas, received some elements of indigenous languages which are distinctly reflected in extant manuscripts. Thus we speak of the so-called "versions" or of Old Church Slavonic (the Czech, Bulgarian, Croatian, Russian, Serbian, etc.). Even this term is somewhat misleading, because the impression is given that only religious writing was done in those "versions." Actually, works on the most varied subjects and themes were composed, and thus a very rich literature with a pan-Slavic character was created. Some Slavs used this written language until the most recent times, abandoning it only about the middle of the nineteenth century, to replace it by their native written language (as the Southern Slavs have done, for instance.) The development of this language and literature is very complex and differs in individual countries. The fact remains that an enormous literature was preserved, which is to be found in manuscripts, old printed books, etc. Thus, the desire of the brothers from Salonica, Constantine and Methodius, to establish a great Slavonic literature was fulfilled. As for the alphabet, the most ancient Old Church Slavonic texts were written in the so-called Glagolitic; the newer Old Church Slavonic and Church Slavonic texts, in the Cyrillic alphabet.

<sup>5</sup> Only a few of the oldest Old Church Slavonic manuscripts are preserved, but their size and the variety of their subject matter make them a treasure of great importance. They include a number of large codices (Gospels, Books of Psalms, Euchologium, etc.). The largest is the *Suprasliensis* manuscript containing 570 pages. The most ancient Slavic manuscripts date from the tenth century (these are copies of older manuscripts, themselves both originals and copies), that is, the so-called Kiev Leaflets. But the majority are from the eleventh century. The oldest Slavic manuscripts are: the *Codex Zographensis* (V. Jagić, *Quattuor evangeliorum codex glagoliticus olim Zographensis nunc Petropolitanus* [Berlin, 1879]); the *Codex Marianus* (V. Jagić, *Quattuor evangeliorum versionis paleoslovenicae codex Marianus glagoliticus* [Berlin, 1883]); the *Codex Assemanianus* (J. Vajs and J. Kurz, *Evangeliarium Assemani, Codex Vaticanus 3. Slavicus glagoliticus, I: Prolegomena, tabulae* [Prague, 1929]; J. Kurz, *Evangeliarium Assemani, Codex Vaticanus Slavicus glagoliticus, II* [Prague, 1955]); the *Psalterium Sinaiticum* (S. Sever'janov, *Sinajskaja psaltrij, glagolitëskij pamjatnik XI vëka* [St. Petersburg, 1922]); the *Euchologium Sinaiticum* (J. Frček, "*Euchologium Sinaiticum, texte slave avec sources grecques et traduction*," *Patrologia Orientalis*, XXIV, fasc. 5 [Paris, 1933], XXV, fasc. 3 [Paris, 1939]; R. Nahtigal, *Euchologium Sinaiticum, starocerkvenoslovanski glagolski spomenik*, I [Ljubljana, 1941], II [Ljubljana, 1942]); the *Clozianus* (A. Dostál, *Clozianus, codex palaeoslovenicus glagoliticus Tridentinus et Oenipontanus* [Prague, 1959]); the Kiev Leaflets (P. C. Mohlberg, *Il messale glagolitico di Kiew (sec. IX) ed il suo prototipo Romano del sec. VI-VII* [Rome, 1928]); the *Savvina kniga* (V. Sčepkin, *Savvina kniga* [St. Petersburg, 1903]); the *Codex Suprasliensis* (S. Sever'janov, *Suprasl'skaja rukopis'* [St. Petersburg, 1904]).

Unfortunately, Slavic scholars have not yet succeeded in analyzing the philological structure of all of these texts. Moreover, we still lack an exhaustive literary history of Old Church Slavonic, and especially of Church Slavonic literature.<sup>7</sup>

The study of this literature is complicated by the fact that most of these texts are only partially preserved. In many manuscripts the beginnings are lost, in others only a small part of the text escaped destruction. The number of texts that have been preserved until to-day is therefore only a torso, but a torso of a complex of writings which, in the past, must have presented a well-chosen whole.<sup>8</sup>

This is evident from the content of the texts which have survived. We are entitled to conclude that translations into Slavonic, in the oldest period, were made according to a well outlined plan.<sup>9</sup> The author of this plan was Con-

<sup>6</sup> Even later, so-called Church Slavonic, manuscripts sometimes preserve very ancient texts from the ninth century. These manuscripts are very numerous, and some are listed in printed catalogues. For example, J. Vašica and J. Vajs, *Soupis staroslovanských rukopisů Národního musea* (Prague, 1957).

<sup>7</sup> The history of Church Slavonic literature has not yet been written because the actual texts of which it consists are mainly found only in manuscripts and old printed books, and, for the most part, have not been published or republished. If we could arrive at an accurate knowledge of it, we would find an extremely rich and extensive literature covering a period of almost one thousand years. It should also be noted that this literature does not belong to any existing language or national group precisely because of its pan-Slavic character. A considerable number of Slavic literary works dealing with various themes have not yet been analyzed. Often the basic question must first be settled as to which language, whether Church Slavonic or some ancient national tongue, a composition belongs. The Byzantine epos *Digenis Akritas*, for example, has been preserved in later Old-Russian manuscripts, but there is serious contention as to whether it was originally written in Church Slavonic and whether it is therefore, in origin, part of that literature. This is true also of Byzantine chronicles, which were freely translated into the Church Slavonic. Very important evidence for this comes from dictionaries of Old Church Slavonic (cf. the Old Church Slavonic dictionary just published) and especially of Church Slavonic, the preparation and publication of which is of interest to Slavists as well as to historians of the Middle Ages and Byzantium.

<sup>8</sup> If we investigate in detail the history of an Old Church Slavonic or Church Slavonic text, we conclude that it is not merely a translation but a real transformation of the text, adapting it to a Slavic milieu. Slavic translators and adapters worked very hard, almost feverishly, trying to translate anything of importance for the culture of the time, and simultaneously adapting themes for the local milieu. They gave topics a more individual presentation or, at times, added their own ideas, or abbreviated texts. In a number of passages it is evident, that they worked as if according to a firmly established plan, which apparently had been already prepared by Constantine and Methodius. This, for instance, is very obvious in theological literature.

<sup>9</sup> The older generation of Slavists often attempted to evaluate the quality of Slavic translated texts, the oldest of which they considered merely as translations. Therefore they were seeking to know, for example, how well the translator knew the language of the original and how well he coped with it. They criticized the translator for omitting or adding passages, that is, for acting arbitrarily or as a compiler. (This was understood to be a defect of mediaeval literature in general.) It is possible to list a number of works which judged the quality of Old Church Slavonic and Church Slavonic texts in this manner: compare the theological literature for an example of this attitude. Actually, this point of view was incorrect, because it considered, a priori, mediaeval Slavic literary production to be inferior. It was then often difficult to explain why the so-called translator omitted or, perhaps, added certain words. It was explained either as arbitrary decision, error, ignorance, and so forth, or as mediaeval fancy and literary style. In reality these changes were adaptations which appear more ingenious as times goes on (they comply with the metric structure of the literary work; express, in fact, the translator's ideas, etc.). We have therefore, nothing short of a refined adaptation of literary themes foreign to the Slavic environment, mentality, and philosophy of life. It is, therefore, impossible to label this literature "translation literature," as some do. Especially, this literature should not be underestimated and contrasted to old mediaeval national literature as to something entirely different. Further study in greater detail will certainly prove that many of these features of literary production persisted in old periods of national literatures as well (the old Czech, the old Russian, etc.).

stantine-Cyril himself, who was a scholar well versed in Byzantine civilization and literature.<sup>10</sup> This fact has, so far, escaped the attention of Slavic specialists, who were more interested in philological and other problems of the texts.

Slavic scholars of the older generation looked upon those texts as translations.<sup>11</sup> Therefore, they continued to search for the originals and studied the accuracy of the translation, questioning the knowledge of Greek and the skill of the translators. They overlooked the fact that the authors of the Slavonic texts may have not only translated but also adapted the Greek original for Slavic consumption.<sup>12</sup> Subsequent studies have shown that very often the translators did rearrange the Greek texts in a more or less original and independent fashion.

Even an important text such as that of the translation of the Gospels, where one would expect a quite literal approach, is more than just a translation.<sup>13</sup> It has an extraordinarily artistic quality, which should be ascribed to the genius of Constantine. But even here we are aware of an adaptation. The Greek text of the K redaction,<sup>14</sup> which was most probably the original from which Constantine made his Slavonic translation, reveals linguistic differences in the four Gospels. The Slavonic translation does not show these differences. It describes the facts in a very lively and graphic manner. The language is

<sup>10</sup> Cf. F. Dvorník, *Les Légendes de Constantin et de Méthode vues de Byzance*, *Byzantinoslavica Supplementa*, I (Prague, 1933), pp. 372, 385ff.; F. Grivec and F. Tomšić, "Constantinus et Methodius Thessalonicensis," *Fontes* (Zagreb, 1960), p. 155ff.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. M. Weingart, *Rukovět' jazyka staroslověnského* (Prague, 1937), p. 34ff.

<sup>12</sup> See, for instance, the interpretation of the Slavic version of the Byzantine epos *Digenis Akritas*.

<sup>13</sup> Neither are Old Church Slavonic Gospel texts merely translations of the Greek, even though these were very important for the missionary activity of Constantine and Methodius. The quality of the Old Church Slavonic texts has been analyzed many times, and it has been repeatedly confirmed that the Slavic version represents a highly artistic text, a poetic text fit for recitation and exegesis as the basis of Christian doctrine. In this case Constantine almost literally translated the original text. He began the translation immediately at the start of his activity in Moravia, or probably even while still in Constantinople. Nevertheless, even this text was to some degree adapted. First of all, he adjusted the text of all four Gospels linguistically (the linguistic differences which can be found in the Greek version between the Gospels disappeared in the Church Slavonic text). The direct speech of the text was respected: the spoken language with its simple turns and metaphors is reflected in the arrangement of the translation into sections and in its dialogue, which is so frequent in the Gospels. This Slavic text had in its original form some words borrowed from the Greek and Slavicized. However, this fact should not be understood as meaning that the vocabulary of the Slavic language was insufficient to convey the meaning of the text, for other quite varied and demanding texts translated into Slavic show, on the contrary, great lexical richness. These foreign words, probably, were quite familiar to Byzantine Slavs (as, for instance, *vlasvimirati*, *skandalisati*, etc.). In newer transcripts these Grecisms decrease because to Western Slavs and in other non-Byzantine areas these Byzantine words were unknown. It is surprising that the first Slavic version of the Gospel is of such high quality from the point of view of the translation itself, the textual arrangement, and the artistic form. This is most often explained by Constantine's great talent, his ability as a writer, and his broad culture. A different explanation offered by J. Kurz, that the Byzantine Slavs could already have been in possession of the Slavic version of the Gospel text before the arrival of the Cyril-Methodian mission to Great Moravia, is not probable. The question may then arise as to why the Byzantine Slavs who spoke and understood Greek would need a Slavic text at the time when they had neither a literary language nor an alphabet.

<sup>14</sup> The Old Church Slavonic Gospel text had as its basis one of the manuscripts then currently in use in Constantinople which represented a codex of the so-called "K" (Constantinople) manuscript and text edition. In addition, several variant readings of the Slavic Gospel text were discovered by editing Western manuscripts. The question of the influence of the Vulgate on the Slavic translation is still controversial. The study of the origin and development of the oldest Slavonic Gospel translation goes back a long way. The founder of Slavic linguistics, Joseph Dobrovský, was already concerned with it, as many more recent scholars have been.

almost childish and naive.<sup>15</sup> And because of this simplicity we can understand why it so greatly fascinated the Slavic audience of Great Moravia. We see, thus, that the work of translation at the time of Cyril and Methodius is often independent and original and shows the desire to accommodate foreign literature to the Slavic mind. Numerous examples can be quoted. If we accept this idea of accommodation, the deviations from the Greek original in the Slavonic texts are explained.<sup>16</sup>

The Slavonic liturgy which we are discussing here presents many complex problems. It is not only the question of the introduction of the Slavic language into the Moravian divine service, but that of discovering which kind of liturgy was chosen by the two brothers.

It is interesting to note that there is a similarity between the Byzantine collection of liturgical books and the collection which is preserved in Slavonic manuscripts. The Byzantine priests used the following books for their liturgical practices: 1. the Euchologium, 2. the Gospel (*apfrakos*—abridged Gospel and the Tetraevangelion), 3. the Apostle (abridged or the full text of the Acts of the Apostles), 4. the Psalter, 5. the Horologion (the Greek breviary), 6. the Triodion (containing the liturgy from Lent to Easter), 7. the Pentekostarion (liturgy from Easter to the first Sunday after Pentecost), 8. Parakletika, 9. the Menologion (the Lives of the Saints), 10. the Akolouthia, and 11. the Typicon (liturgical handbook).<sup>17</sup> Almost all these texts are preserved in Slavonic manuscripts of the tenth century, or in those of more recent date. Only the Typicon (liturgical handbook) is not among the oldest collection of Slavonic liturgical books. The text we have today is of a later redaction.<sup>18</sup>

This shows that the translators intended to put into Slavonic the whole ensemble of Byzantine liturgical books (въсъ čинъ).<sup>19</sup> If we accept this idea, then we may suppose that the initiators meant to introduce into Great Moravia the same religious order with all its liturgical acts as existed in Byzantium.

However, we have, at the same time, to consider that on the arrival of the Byzantine mission Moravia was already Christianized to a great extent.<sup>20</sup> This

<sup>15</sup> The Old Church Slavonic language as preserved in the texts uses simple turns and phrases, as is usually the case with the first phase of development of a literary language which is based on a spoken tongue. These phrases and turns, developed from plain and uncomplicated notions, impress the modern reader as having a certain child-like, pleasing simplicity. Thus formulated, this text was close to the Slavic listener, and had an effect of nobility and dignity when it was read. The fact that Old Church Slavonic was very melodious (for instance, a regular alternation of consonants and vowels is strongly emphasized), also contributed to the quality of the translation.

<sup>16</sup> See documents concerning this statement in works dealing with the study of Old Church Slavonic texts, for example: A. Dostál, "K slovanským verzím byzantských kronik" (A propos des versions slaves des chroniques byzantines)," *Acta Univ. Carolinae, Philologica* 3, *Slavica Pragensia* IV (Prague, 1963), pp. 663–670.

<sup>17</sup> The Typicon was translated into Old Church Slavonic later, not during the time of Constantine and Methodius.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. H.-G. Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im Byzantinischen Reich* (Munich, 1959), p. 252 ff.

<sup>19</sup> See F. Grivec–F. Tomšič, *op. cit.*, p. 202.

<sup>20</sup> Archaeological excavations which have been carried on for several years in the area of Great Moravia (in Mikulčice, Staré Město, Pohansko, and Nitra) have already produced surprising results. In Mikulčice, for example, the discovery of a large number of church buildings from the first half of the ninth century—the period, therefore, before the arrival of the Byzantine mission—is clear evidence that Christianity existed to a significant degree even before Constantine and Methodius themselves were active.

presupposes that a liturgy must have been introduced into Moravia before 863. What kind of liturgy? If it was an Eastern liturgy, was it that of St. Chrysostom or of St. Basil? If it was a Western liturgy, which sacramentary was chosen? Did there exist only one liturgy, or was the Mass celebrated in different rites?

The Legends tell us that before the arrival of the Byzantine brothers, missionaries from Germany, Italy, and Greece were working in Moravia.<sup>21</sup> This information is attributed to the Moravian ambassadors who asked the Byzantine emperor to send teachers into Moravia capable of instructing the Moravians in Slavonic. This seems important to me and I disagree with Isačenko who thinks that the missionaries from Greece were not Greeks.<sup>22</sup> Since they came from Byzantium, I assume they must have been Greeks and must have used a Byzantine liturgy. Of course, we cannot say to what extent they used this liturgy or which liturgy it was, whether that of St. Chrysostom or of St. Basil.

Among the oldest Slavonic texts there are some which are definitely liturgical. These are, first, the Leaflets of Kiev, the oldest known Slavonic manuscript;<sup>23</sup> then the Leaflets of Vienna,<sup>24</sup> the content of which is similar to that of the Kiev manuscript, although this document is of later date. Then, there are the Fragments from Prague;<sup>25</sup> the Fragments from Freising;<sup>26</sup> the Manuscript of Chilandari from Mount Athos;<sup>27</sup> three leaves found in the monastery of Sinai;<sup>28</sup> breviaries, and some other texts.<sup>29</sup>

Concerning the character of these documents, the language of the Leaflets of Kiev is the most ancient of all the documents mentioned. It contains some Latin words which have not been translated, for example *préfacia*, *oblatz*. We also find traces of the Czech language. The Leaflets of Kiev were found in Jerusalem, and only seven folios are preserved, but on the first page of the first folio and on the last page of the seventh folio another non-liturgical text is copied. The original of the Kievan Leaflets were perhaps written in Latin.

The Fragments from Prague consist of two leaflets only, containing prayers for certain feast days, which also show traces of the Czech language. The original from which they were translated was Greek, but it has not yet been traced.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. F. Dvorník, *Les Légendes* . . ., p. 385; F. Grivec-F. Tomšič, *op. cit.*, p. 155.

<sup>22</sup> This is the opinion, for instance, of Prof. A. V. Isačenko and others, but I think in this case it is impossible not to believe the legend. It is very improbable that a priest from Byzantium would not have penetrated into the territory of Great Moravia when there is evidence of commercial and other relations between the two. Cf. A. V. Isačenko. "К вопросы об ирландской миссии у паннонских и моравских славян, *Вопросы языкоизнания* 7" (1963) pp. 43-72.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. the edition by Mohlberg, *op. cit.*, M. Weingart and J. Kurz, *Texty ke studiu jazyka a písmenictví staroslověnského*, 2nd ed. (Prague, 1949), pp. 114-137.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. M. Weingart-J. Kurz, *op. cit.*, pp. 139-141.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. M. Weingart-J. Kurz, *op. cit.*, pp. 146-149.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. M. Weingart-J. Kurz, *op. cit.*, pp. 150-160.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. P. Uspenskij, *Vtoroje puiěšestvíje po sv. gore Athonskoj v gody 1858, 1859 i 1861* (Moscow, 1880), pp. 179-185.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. R. Nahrigal, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 337-345; M. Weingart-J. Kurz, *op. cit.*, pp. 142-145.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. J. Vajs "Kánon charvatskohlaholského vatikánského missálu (Illyr 4), *Časopis pro mod. filol.* XXV (Prague, 1939), pp. 113-134; *idem*, "Mešní řád charvatskohlaholského vatikánského missálu (Illyr 4) a jeho poměr k moravskopanonskému sakramentáři stol. IX," *Acta académiae Velehra-densis* (Prague, 1939).

The Fragments from Freising are a translation from an Old High German original. They are written in Latin and their language shows that they were intended for the Slovanes. The original was probably a penitentiary book.<sup>30</sup>

The three folios of Sinai are important because they contain a part of the liturgy of St. Chrysostom. One prayer is listed wrongly as being from the liturgy of St. Basil. For a long time these three leaflets were thought of as an independent text. Now, however, it is generally agreed that they are a part of the *Euchologium* of Sinai.<sup>31</sup>

This *Euchologium* contains non-liturgical prayers (trebnik) and, together with the three folios of Sinai (služebnik), represents a combination which was common in Byzantium. Parts of the *Euchologium* are translations from the Greek, but one of the prayers is translated from Old High German. Many Greek *Euchologia* are known, but this Slavonic text is different from any of them. This text was published in 1880 by Geitler,<sup>32</sup> but the edition was so inaccurate that a thorough study of it was impossible. Only recently have the editions of Frček (1933, 1939)<sup>33</sup> and of Nahtigal (1942)<sup>34</sup> allowed scholars to appreciate it better. It is an important text, requiring further study.

The question now arises as to which of these documents is the key text for the solution of the problem of the origins of Slavonic liturgy. From the linguistic point of view the Leaflets of Kiev should be regarded as the oldest

<sup>30</sup> Cf. A. V. Isačenko, *Jazyk a pôvod Frizinských pamiatok* (Bratislava, 1943); *idem*, *Začiatky vzdelenosti vo Vel'komoravskej ríši* (Turč. Sv. Martin, 1948).

<sup>31</sup> Cf. L. Geitler, *Euchologium. Glagolski spomenik manastira Sinai brda* (Zagreb, 1882); J. Frček, *op. cit.*, I, p. 612 ff.

<sup>32</sup> The oldest edition of the *Euchologium Sinaiticum* was produced in 1882 by L. Geitler. (See note 31.) It is a very poor edition, since Geitler had to copy the text very rapidly, under unfavorable conditions, from a Glagolitic manuscript and, as a result, it contains many errors. The unavailability of a text in Greek was an additional reason why the language, composition, and meaning of the *Euchologium Sinaiticum* were poorly understood. Therefore, for a long time, this text was not properly appreciated, and as recently as the first decades of this century it was still very puzzling. In addition, the so-called Sinaitic Fragments containing liturgical prayers are now considered part of the manuscript and text of the *Euchologium Sinaiticum*, whereas formerly they were not. At one time they were separated from the manuscript of the *Euchologium*. Because of inaccurate measuring, their dimensions were recorded as different from those of the manuscript itself. This created the impression that there were two completely distinct manuscripts. The combining of the non-liturgical text, i.e., the larger part of the preserved *Euchologium* manuscript, the portion published by Geitler, with the liturgical text, which was preserved in the Fragments, is a fact of central importance to our problem. The *Euchologium* is a Byzantine Eastern text. This combination of non-liturgical and liturgical prayers is completely unknown in the West and in Western liturgy.

<sup>33</sup> Studies by J. Frček (see note 5), who prepared a new edition even though he did not have access to the photographed manuscript, constituted the first advancement in the knowledge of this important text. First of all, he discovered texts in different Greek manuscripts which corresponded with the prayers in the *Euchologium*, and of these he found the greater part. (Several texts in Old High German were already known to V. Vondrák.) By comparing the Glagolitic with Greek texts and by emphasizing the meaning of the context, Frček pointed out several linguistic errors committed by L. Geitler in his edition and corrected them in his own edition. Many of the interpretations of the *Euchologium Sinaiticum* made by Frček were confirmed in a later edition by R. Nahtigal, who had photographs of the entire manuscript at his disposal. The American scientific expedition to the monastery of St. Catherine on Mt. Sinai in 1950 photographed all the Slavic manuscripts for the Library of Congress in Washington, so that all Sinaitic manuscripts are now available for research.

<sup>34</sup> Nahtigal's edition has two parts: the first contains photographs of the entire manuscript; the second, the transcript into Cyrillic and annotations. Frček's edition has one advantage. According to principles of the French school of editing, it offers a French translation (with annotation) of the whole text. This made it accessible in its entirety for liturgical research, even to non-Slavists. This text calls for thorough analysis, especially because it obviously contains two linguistic strata.

document. Slavic philologists used to date it first from the eleventh century, then from the middle of the tenth, lately even from the very beginning of the tenth century. On the basis of recent studies made by Baumstark,<sup>35</sup> Mohlberg,<sup>36</sup> Vajs<sup>37</sup> and Vašica,<sup>38</sup> the specialists in liturgical matters, the Leaflets are considered by many scholars to be the work of Constantine himself, who is believed to have translated them from a Latin original. Mohlberg has shown that the sacramentary preserved in Codex D 47 in Padua is probably the text nearest to the original used by Constantine. These scholars think that the Kiev Leaflets contain a Slavonic translation of the liturgy of St. Peter. This liturgy is a Greek translation of the Latin Roman Mass formula to which some Byzantine elements were added.<sup>39</sup>

<sup>35</sup> Baumstark was an outstanding liturgist but no Slavist.

<sup>36</sup> The formulation of the title of his study conveys Mohlberg's interpretation that the Kiev Leaflets were the work of Constantine (*Il Messale glagolitico di Kiev (Sec. IX) ed il suo prototipo Romano del sec. VI-VII*). Even though Mohlberg critically surveyed the extensive literature concerning the Kiev Leaflets, they still require specialized linguistic and prosodic study in order to confirm or refute their authorship by Constantine. A misleading fact about the Kiev Leaflets is, first of all, that they are the most ancient handwritten texts, the oldest of all extant Slavonic manuscripts (the manuscript is an ancient one, of small size, written in the oldest type of Glagolitic script). Nevertheless, in spite of this, the Kiev Leaflets do not reflect the most ancient Old Church Slavonic language, as R. Jakobson has proved.

<sup>37</sup> When one wanted to prove identity of authorship of an ancient Glagolitic text (that the author was Constantine, for example), lexical evidence was usually produced. It is ascertained whether words found in the Gospel text, i.e., in a text where Constantine's authorship is absolutely certain (because of wording, historical reasons, etc.), are employed. However, lexical evidence is, in my opinion, the weakest argument: if we can prove that the word in question is found in an ancient manuscript, it is very difficult to prove that it was not previously commonly known. To my way of thinking, the fact that the vocabulary of the Kiev Leaflets is ancient and identical with that of the Gospel text, i.e., of the Constantine translation, proves only that the author of the Kiev Fragments knew the Gospel text. That it is a more recent text is clearly shown by several newer linguistic phenomena, for instance: there is a complete absence of non-contracted adjectives in the Kiev Leaflets, a manuscript that is linguistically and orthographically very precise and ancient, as Roman Jakobson has proved; furthermore, there is the dependence of these forms on the metrical construction of the Kiev Leaflets (i.e. only the contracted adjectival forms which were preserved there are tied in with the metrical structure of the Leaflets' text, in the same number of syllables). Further reasons (Latinisms, Bohemisms, similarity to the text of the Padua Sacramentary D 47) provide evidence that the history of the Kiev Leaflets is more complicated than was previously believed. The Kiev Leaflets show, further, that the environment in which they originated was fluent in the Slavic, Greek, and Latin languages. Its Bohemisms permit us to ascribe the text to the Czech period of the Old Church Slavonic literature, but not to the Great Moravian period.

<sup>38</sup> Prof. J. Vašica accepts, on the whole, the reasoning of Vajs and adds something of his own. He sums up again in *Slovo a slovesnost*, VI (Prague, 1940), p. 65 ff. the facts about the age of the Kiev Leaflets: 1. they are in the oldest type of the Glagolitic script; 2. their Czech origin is indicated both by some phonetic deviations ("c," "z" instead of "št," "žd"), and by their vocabulary; 3. linguistically speaking, they are unreliable literary documents; 4. as to liturgy, we are on much firmer ground; 5. Mohlberg credited Constantine and Methodius with their authorship; 6. their Cyrillo-Methodian origin is generally recognized. Vašica finally admits that the Kiev Leaflets were translated by Constantine himself. The study mentioned above states on page 76 that: a systematic combination of the Byzantine and Western (Gregorian) liturgies is the consequence of the author's (Constantine's) personality. The fact that the Kiev Leaflets are texts which fell into disuse in the second half of the ninth century speaks in favor of this theory. Constantine was known for his interest in ancient texts. In his conclusion Vašica clearly stresses that the Kiev Leaflets are "the most precious pieces of Slavonic liturgy and they bear the stamp of the spirit of the great Constantine." As for the evidence of Constantine's authorship, we may thus recapitulate: its most important supporter was Mohlberg, but, in addition, Prof. J. Vajs, stressed their ancient origin, as did Prof. J. Vašica, and it was accepted by a majority of Czech and other Slavists. Nevertheless, this question remains open, and a linguistic analysis of the entire document is called for.

<sup>39</sup> St. Peter's liturgy is usually designated as a Western liturgy within a Byzantine framework (not of course, a liturgy used in a Roman city specifically, but one commonly in use in Illyricum). Prof.

This shows us that Constantine, coming to Moravia, saw that a Western liturgy was already in use in that country. In order to avoid complications, he accepted it, adapting to the Slavonic language the Greek translation of the Latin Mass, called the liturgy of St. Peter. The scholars who are of this opinion believe that the so-called liturgy of St. Peter was used in Thessalonica and perhaps elsewhere in the former Illyricum, which was under the jurisdiction of Rome up to the year 732.<sup>40</sup> Thus, the problem of the origin of the Slavonic liturgy would seem to be solved.

This proposed solution, however, has certain weaknesses. Baumstark and Mohlberg have studied the problem only as specialists of Western liturgy. The two Slavists and liturgists, Professors Vajs and Vašica, went further, studying the document from the philological point of view. Vajs has shown that in the Leaflets of Kiev we find Old Church Slavonic words which are used also in the translation of the Gospels made by Constantine.<sup>41</sup> Vašica pointed out that some Latin and Slavonic terms used in the Leaflets correspond to words used in the Latin sacramentary.<sup>42</sup>

This is interesting, but we must be cautious in using the similarity of certain words in the Kievan document and in the Gospels as an argument for Constantine's authorship.<sup>43</sup> The analysis of the oldest Slavonic texts from the linguistic point of view is only partly done. Generally, words retain the same meaning for a long time. Therefore, the fact that in both documents identical words are used does not seem to prove that the Leaflets and the Gospels are the work of the same author. Neither does the use of the same Latin words in the Leaflets and in the sacramentary prove anything about the identity of the author. There are also other Latin and Slavonic expressions in the text which do not correspond to those used in the sacramentary.

Because of this, some Slavic philologists think that Constantine's authorship of the Kievan Leaflets cannot be proved.<sup>44</sup> There is, however, another possible clue. We have seen that Czech linguistic traits can be detected in the Kievan Leaflets. After the death of St. Methodius and after the destruction of the Moravian Empire, the center of Slavonic literary activity was transferred from Moravia to Bohemia, where Slavonic, Latin, and Greek books

---

Vašica, for example, describes it so. According to this conception, it would represent a compromise between the Byzantine and Western liturgies, a compromise which for understandable diplomatic reasons Constantine would have made himself, in order to avoid conflict between the Western liturgy already extant in Great Moravia and the Byzantine one newly introduced.

<sup>40</sup> See J. Vašica, "Slovanská liturgie nově osvětlená Kijevskými listy," *Slovo a slovesnost*, VI (Prague, 1940), pp. 65-77; *idem*, "Slovanská liturgie sv. Petra," *Byzantinoslavica*, VIII (Prague, 1939-40), pp. 1-54.

<sup>41</sup> There is also the question of how St. Peter's liturgy would have been introduced. Had it been only a little-known form of liturgy, its use in Salonica at least, or even throughout Illyricum, would have to be proved, as Prof. J. Vašica thought. But that this liturgy was known in Salonica is shown by the Chilandari Fragments containing a Slavonic version of it, which is from a later period, of course. Certainly, this Athos manuscript does not and cannot indicate the oldest period; in my opinion it is a much more recent translation.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. J. Vašica, "Slovanská liturgie nově osvětlená Kijevskými listy," *Slovo a slovesnost*, VI (Prague, 1940), p. 65 ff.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. J. Vajs, *Kyjevské listy a jejich latinský (římský) originál* (rev., Bratislava, 1930), p. 527 ff.

<sup>44</sup> The assertion that the author or the compiler of the liturgical manual, the Leaflets of Kiev, was also Constantine has met with very serious opposition.

were used. One can thus conclude that the Leaflets originated in Bohemia in the tenth century.<sup>45</sup> If this was so, the Leaflets cannot be looked upon as the oldest Slavonic document of Moravian and Cyrillo-Methodian origin. This weakens the theory that Constantine accepted the Western liturgy after coming to Moravia. All this shows that the Kievan Leaflets need to be further analyzed and studied from the philological, metrical, and other points of view before we can come to a definite conclusion.

The Fragments from Prague are, from the linguistic point of view, of a more recent date than the Leaflets of Kiev. The original text of these Fragments is translated from the Greek. It is not clear, however, where this prototype originated. The Slavist Vondrák thought that they were copied from a Bulgarian original. Sreznevskij was of the opinion that the prototype was a Russian manuscript. Jagić supposed that they were copied from a Russian-Bulgarian manuscript. Recently, F. V. Mareš made a detailed analysis of that document and found in it some elements of the Russian language. He concluded that the Fragments were copied in the Glagolitic alphabet from a manuscript written in the Cyrillic alphabet somewhere in Kievan Russia. His main argument is that the Glagolitic letter called large I, which in the Glagolitic alphabet is also used to express the number 20, is used by the copyist for the number 8, as is the case in the Cyrillic alphabet.<sup>46</sup>

In my opinion Mareš' argument is not convincing. There are several Slavonic manuscripts written in the Cyrillic alphabet in which one finds Glagolitic letters. The Czech Bible from the fifteenth century was written in the Glagolitic alphabet, although at that time the Cyrillic alphabet was in general use by the Orthodox Slavs.<sup>47</sup> The so-called Gospel of Rheims, on which the French kings used to take the oath at the coronation ceremony, is composed of two parts: one written in Cyrillic letters, probably in the twelfth century, and the other written in the Glagolitic alphabet, probably in the fourteenth century (1395).<sup>48</sup> One can conclude from this that the copyists of Slavonic works were at one time familiar with both alphabets, and that therefore the use of a Glagolitic letter in a Cyrillic manuscript can be explained as a slip of the pen.<sup>49</sup>

<sup>45</sup> After the death of Methodius, the center of Slavonic culture, and therefore also of Slavonic liturgy, moved to Bohemia. We have evidence, for instance, that St. Wenceslas learned from Slavic books and that the Slavonic cultural and liturgical center was the Sázava monastery.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. F. V. Mareš, "Pražské zlomky a jejich předloha v světle hláskoslovného rozboru," *Slavia*, XX (1950-51), pp. 219-32. Using a phonetic analysis as a basis, Mareš concludes that the Prague Fragments were copied from a manuscript of Russian origin. The use of a large И to express the numerical value of the digit eight means, according to Mareš, that the manuscript of the Prague Fragments was copied from one written in Cyrillic script (the Prague Fragments are written in Glagolitic script). In my opinion, the lexical analysis by Mareš weakened somewhat the assumption that a manuscript of Russian origin served as a model for the Prague Fragments. Nevertheless, Mareš says that the vocabulary of this text shows its ancient origin. With regard to the large И, I believe that in an environment which used the Cyrillic in addition to the Glagolitic alphabet, errors were easily come by. The copyist of the Glagolitic manuscript, who also knew the Cyrillic alphabet, could simply have made a mistake.

<sup>47</sup> This Czech bible, written in Glagolitic but in the Czech language, was probably copied in a center of Church Slavonic literature (Emaüs).

<sup>48</sup> See *L'évangéliaire slavon de Reims, dit: Texte du Sacré*, ed. by L. Léger (Reims-Prague, 1899).

<sup>49</sup> Cf. the Fragments of M. P. Pogodin, for instance. It is a Cyrillic manuscript, but its copyist used the Glagolitic as well. See G. Iljinskij, "Pogodinskije kirillovsko-glagoličeskije listki," *Byzantinoslavica*, I (1929), pp. 86-117.

It is thus very difficult to determine the prototype of the Fragments from Prague. Moreover, the Fragments are a palimpsest manuscript. Many letters are illegible. This could be remedied one day with the help of modern ultrared examination equipment. Unfortunately, this has not yet been done.

Last year the Catholic Faculty of Theology published in Prague, on the occasion of the eleventh centenary of the advent of the two brothers into Moravia, a symposium under the title "Solunští bratři"—The Brothers of Thessalonica.<sup>50</sup> Two of the studies included in this symposium are, in some ways, complementary to each other. The art historian Cibulka, in his review of Moravian church architecture, repeats his theory that all Moravian churches so far discovered were built before the arrival of the Byzantine mission and that the first of them were erected by Irish missionaries in the Hiberno-Scottish style. Another study, written by L. Pokorný, is devoted to the problem of the origin of the Slavonic liturgy. The author disagrees with the two Slavic philologists and liturgists—Vajs and Vašica—concerning the importance of the Kievan Leaflets for the study of the Slavonic liturgy. In his opinion the most important Slavonic liturgical texts are the Fragments from Prague. In analyzing them from the liturgical point of view, he concludes that this document is older than the Leaflets of Kiev and that it presupposes the existence of a Western liturgical Mass formula now unknown, but which, in the ninth century, was in use in the lands between Milan and Constantinople.<sup>51</sup> He attributes the use of this liturgy to the Hiberno-Scottish monks who had introduced it into Moravia. It is evident that, influenced by the Irish theory of his former teacher Cibulka, he tries to strengthen this theory with his liturgical arguments. One can see also that he is anxious to eliminate, insofar as possible, the Eastern elements of Moravian Christianity when trying to show that in the West the Irish missionaries and, after them, the Frankish missionaries from Salzburg played the principal role in the organization of the Moravian Church and its liturgy.<sup>52</sup>

Unfortunately, the author does not pay any attention in his study to the philological problems which this document presents. He disregards the fact, confirmed by philological analysis, that the prototype of the Fragments from Prague was translated from the Greek. The Fragments also contain a Byzantine prayer called "lychnikos." This is another indication that their original was Greek. This prayer cannot be traced in any Western Mass formula, but Pokorný simply presupposes its existence in a formula which is unknown. He calls this

<sup>50</sup> *Solunští bratři, 1100 let od příchodu sv. Cyrila a Metoděje na Moravu* (Prague, 1963). See particularly the study by L. Pokorný, "Liturgie pěje slovanský," *op. cit.*, pp. 158–91.

<sup>51</sup> Pokorný has in mind "a Western liturgy, which was currently in use between Milan and Constantinople." Cf. note 50 *supra*. However, nothing definite can be stated about this liturgy; the author himself admits (*op. cit.*, p. 174) that it is not possible to say what kind of liturgy it was.

<sup>52</sup> Pokorný bases his interpretation on the following facts: 1. He puts more emphasis on the Fragments from Prague than on the Kiev Leaflets. He does not, however, explain the problem of the Kiev Leaflets. In any case, we cannot antedate the Prague Fragments before the Kiev Leaflets, either from the point of view of the manuscript itself or from its text. 2. He does not accept the Vašica-Vajs interpretation of St. Peter's liturgy, but he is obviously attempting an analogical interpretation in the sphere of liturgy to that of Prof. Cibulka in the sphere of church construction in Moravia (in the sense of the so-called Hiberno-Scottish theory).

the liturgy of Cyril and Methodius without being able to show that the two brothers had accepted it.<sup>53</sup> This attempt at the reconstruction of the Slavonic liturgy must be rejected.

Another young scholar, J. Smržík, shows more restraint in his work on Roman Slavonic liturgy.<sup>54</sup> He accepts the opinion of Vajs and Vašica, and characterizes the Moravian liturgy as Romano-Slavonic and its basis as the liturgy of St. Peter. One remark deserves special mention. He shows that the oldest Slavonic liturgical texts are written in the Glagolitic alphabet, not in Cyrillic. This is important from the philological point of view. The language of the Glagolitic documents has a more ancient character than that of the texts written in Cyrillic letters. At the same time, Smržík admits that the brothers may have used the Byzantine liturgy during the first year of their stay in Moravia, but later introduced the Roman liturgy which was more familiar to the Moravians.<sup>55</sup>

The German liturgist Kl. Gamber last year published a study in which he tried to show that the Leaflets of Kiev contain the liturgy introduced by Methodius. He finds the argument for his assertion in the document sent in 871 to Louis the German by the Frankish hierarchy. In protesting against the encroachment of Methodius into territory regarded as being under their jurisdiction, the bishops said that he had translated the Mass from a Latin text.<sup>56</sup>

Special attention must be paid to two other texts mentioned by me, the *Euchologium Sinaiticum* and the three folios of Sinai which are parts of the *Euchologium*. We have here a Mass formula and prayers for other liturgical ceremonies, a combination which was common in Byzantine liturgical writings.

The liturgical text from the three folios contains the Byzantine liturgy of St. John Chrysostom. The *Euchologium* contains prayers which were recited by the priests during different religious ceremonies, and, as I mentioned before, it was published by the late Czech philologist Frček. It is important to note that one of the prayers of the *Euchologium* was known in Prague in the tenth century; this is the prayer which the priest recited when cutting the hair of a boy who was, by this ceremony, initiated into manhood. Frček had shown that the same ceremony, according to the Byzantine rite, was performed by the Czech prince St. Wenceslas.

Frček and I came to the conclusion that the *Euchologium* is a highly important document for Slavic philology. Some parts reveal a very ancient vocabulary which may go back to the Cyrillo-Methodian period. Other parts

<sup>53</sup> The terminology of the Slavonic liturgy is not used in a uniform way. Slavic philologists had mostly in mind only the Slavonic language during the divine liturgy service. Smržík states plainly that the Slavonic liturgy was "Slavonic-Roman," following a theory closest to that of the St. Peter liturgy.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. S. Smržík, *The Glagolitic or Roman-Slavonic Liturgy* (Cleveland-Rome, 1959).

<sup>55</sup> Cf. Smržík, *op. cit.*, p. 98.

<sup>56</sup> Gamber tries to prove that the conformity of the Kiev Leaflets to the D 47 Sacramentary is only accidental. This conformity, however, is important. Cf. Kl. Gamber, "Das glagolitische Sakramenter der Slavenapostel Cyril und Method und seine lateinische Vorlage," *Ostkirchl. Stud.*, 6 (Würzburg, 1957), pp. 165-173.

are of much later date. The analysis of the *Euchologium* has only just begun. I am convinced that the key to the solution of the problems connected with the introduction of the Slavonic liturgy lies within this analysis, not in that of the other documents previously mentioned.<sup>57</sup>

The other Slavonic liturgical texts are of less importance. Let me mention only the manuscript of the Chilandari monastery containing the liturgy of St. Peter. It shows that this liturgy was in use on Mount Athos during the Middle Ages.<sup>58</sup>

Let us now review the results so far achieved by the research of the Slavic philologists, from the point of view of the liturgical ceremonies.

In Byzantium the popular liturgy was that of St. Basil. Later, probably in the ninth century, during the lives of the two brothers, the liturgy of St. John Chrysostom was more in favor. Besides these two liturgies, there existed the liturgy of the *praesanctificata* used during Lent, and the liturgy of St. Peter. The latter was not well known. Professor H. G. Beck characterizes it only as "Stubenarbeit" or as "bloße Schreibtischarbeit."<sup>59</sup> In any case, the liturgy of St. Peter was not in official and current use.

It should be emphasized that the works of St. John Chrysostom had been translated often into Slavonic, from the oldest to the more recent period. It is known that in the old Slavonic collection called *Codex Clozianus* we read a homily which is now attributed by all specialists to St. Methodius. In the same collection there are also several Slavonic translations of Chrysostom's works.<sup>60</sup> Other such translations are in the homiliary of Mihanović and in the *Codex Suprasliensis*. This shows that St. Chrysostom was very popular among the ancient Slavs. In this respect, the fact that only the liturgy of St. Chrysostom is preserved in a Slavonic manuscript seems to be of some significance. No other Byzantine liturgy, except that of St. Peter, has, so far, been found in a Slavonic translation.

The opinion that the liturgy of St. Peter was the liturgy used in Moravia is based on the supposition that the Leaflets of Kiev which contain it were composed by Constantine. Vašica, the main supporter of this opinion, explains the choice of this liturgy by Constantine as resulting from Constantine's veneration of St. Peter.<sup>61</sup> I do not think that this explanation is satisfactory. Constantine was a realist and a very thorough scholar, and he revealed his genius in his philological and linguistic work. The Glagolitic alphabet which he composed

<sup>57</sup> Concerning the *Euchologium Sinaiticum*, P. Lang has written "Jazykovědný rozbor Euchologia Sinajského," *Zprávy o c. k. reál. a vyšším gymnasiu v Příbrami*, I (*Pravopis a hláskosloví*) (1888), pp. 1-53; II (*Tvarosloví: Deklinace*) (1889), pp. 1-80; *Konjugace* (1890), pp. 1-53. J. Frček says about the study by P. Lang, "on s'apperçoit aussitôt que ce travail fourmille d'erreurs." (*op. cit.*, p. 624).

<sup>58</sup> See note 27 *supra*.

<sup>59</sup> Cf. H.-G. Beck, *op. cit.*, p. 242.

<sup>60</sup> The works of St. John Chrysostom were well known to Constantine and Methodius, and Old Church Slavonic and Church Slavonic literature contain a considerable number of translations from them. Constantine and Methodius and their disciples certainly considered these works very important for Slavic culture. This can only strengthen the assumption that the first liturgy introduced by Constantine into Great Moravia was that of St. John Chrysostom, which was then commonly in use in Constantinople and Byzantium.

<sup>61</sup> See note 40 *supra*.

shows how carefully he had observed the phonological character of the Slavonic language.<sup>62</sup> It is a masterly work admired by all Slavic philologists. I cannot believe that such a genius would let himself be guided by his own personal fancy in the selection of such an important matter as the divine liturgy.

The choice of the liturgy of St. Peter by him could be explained if we could suppose that this liturgy was introduced into Moravia by Greek priests who, as the legends have it, were working there before the arrival of the brothers. This, however, cannot be proved.

In general, we do not know what kind of liturgy was in use in Moravia before 863. It is generally believed that Constantine found there only the Western liturgy, though we cannot prove this. The argument advanced by Ginzel,<sup>63</sup> namely, that Constantine and Methodius, as simple priest and deacon, could not have introduced another liturgy into Moravia—for this could be done only by bishops—is irrelevant. The brothers were sent to Moravia by the Byzantine Emperor Michael, and his Patriarch Photius, not by Rome. Rostislav, the ruler of Moravia, expected that their religious activities would eliminate from Moravia the influence of the Frankish ecclesiastics. All this entitled them to bring with them Byzantine theological literature and to translate it into Slavonic. We have already seen that the Slavonic translations also contain the whole complex of the Byzantine liturgical books. This indicates that it was their express intention to introduce the Byzantine liturgy into Moravia.

It is interesting to note that many of the older generation of Slavic philologists were of this opinion. J. Dobrovský thought that only the disciples of Methodius had chosen the liturgy of the Roman rite.<sup>64</sup> This was also the view of F. Pastrnek. The Roman rite was introduced by the brothers only later, when they had seen how difficult it was for their disciples to learn Greek. This kind of argument can, of course, be dismissed. Translations from the Greek were made also by Methodius' disciples.<sup>65</sup> A. Brückner, who was of Polish origin and professor at the University of Berlin, favored of course the Roman thesis.<sup>66</sup> Only modern Slavic philologists, impressed by the studies of Baumstark, Mohlberg, and Vajs, are inclined to accept the idea that Constantine had introduced the liturgy of St. Peter as contained in the Leaflets of Kiev.

As I have already shown, we are not certain that the Kiev Leaflets are the most ancient Slavonic monuments of the Moravian period. There are, as we have seen, two weak points in the argumentation by Vajs and Vašica. First, the authorship of Constantine is not yet proven. Second, the similarity between

<sup>62</sup> The Glagolitic alphabet was very ingeniously constructed and, as N. Trubeckoj (*Altkirchenslavische Grammatik* [Vienna, 1954], p. 15ff.) and others have demonstrated, reflected precisely all the so-called phonological distinctions of the Old Church Slavonic language (i.e., the distinction between sounds, which was considered important to a speaker as a means of distinguishing word meaning).

<sup>63</sup> Cf. J. A. Ginzel, *Geschichte der Slawenapostel Cyril und Method und der slawischen Liturgie* (Vienna, 1861).

<sup>64</sup> Cf. J. Dobrovský, *Cyril a Method, apoštolové slovanští. Poznámkami opatřil J. Vajs* (Prague, 1948).

<sup>65</sup> Cf. F. Pastrnek, *Dějiny slovanských apoštolů Cyrilla a Methoda s rozbořem a otiskem hlavních pramenů* (Prague, 1902).

<sup>66</sup> Cf. A. Brückner, *Die Wahrheit über die Slawenapostel* (Tübingen, 1913).

the vocabulary of the Leaflets and Constantine's translation of the Gospels cannot be taken as a convincing argument until a more thorough investigation has revealed further and more convincing correspondences.

We must admit that the results of the excavations made in Moravia are, so far, rather in favor of Vajs' thesis.<sup>67</sup> They show that during the first half of the ninth century Moravia was very much under Western cultural, political, and religious influences. So far, little has been discovered which can be dated from the Cyrillo-Methodian period, but, we must not forget that the excavations are not yet finished. Czech archaeologists say that what they have already found is only the beginning. Discoveries of even greater interest and importance are expected in the coming years,<sup>68</sup> and it is to be hoped that they will throw more light on the period characterized by the activity of the two brothers.

Let me mention two more opinions concerning Constantine's attitude toward the Slavonic liturgy. The Croat specialist, S. Rittig,<sup>69</sup> calls our attention to the fact that in the *Vita Constantini* the Eucharist is called *Služba*, which is evidently a translation of a Byzantine expression. The *Vita Methodii*, however, uses the Latin terminology—*mša*—*Missa*. Rittig deduced from this that in Moravia Constantine continued to celebrate the Eucharist in Greek, not in Slavonic. This is an exaggeration. We know how energetically Constantine, in his discussion with Latin priests in Venice, defended the use of the Slavonic language. One cannot imagine that the object of the discussion could have been only the use of the Slavonic in instruction and in the writing of religious books. It was the celebrating of the Eucharist in Slavonic that had shocked the Latin priests. As for the terminology *Služba* and *mša*, the difference in choice of words can only have been accidental. It is probable that the author of the *Vita Methodii* used the Latin word because he was living in a Western atmosphere and was familiar with Latin terms.<sup>70</sup>

Constantine is supposed to have celebrated Mass in Rome, in the presence of the Bishop Arsenius and the papal secretary Anastasius, both of whom knew Greek.<sup>71</sup> Because of this, some scholars have deduced that Constantine celebrated in the Byzantine rite and in Greek. This could have been so because the Byzantine rite was not unknown in Rome; but we must remember that Pope Hadrian had already blessed the Slavic books, putting them on the altar

<sup>67</sup> The present excavations in the territory of Great Moravia at this time favor the opinion of a more ancient presence of Christianity in Moravia and thus, indirectly, the assumption that the Western liturgy was already considerably widespread there before the arrival of the Byzantine mission. Of course, the excavations have not been completed, and one can certainly expect further discoveries, according to the archaeologists themselves. Such an important period in the history of Great Moravia as the Cyrillo-Methodian undoubtedly will finally be more distinctly revealed by archaeological findings. Up to the present, however, it has not materialized significantly.

<sup>68</sup> Compare also the exhibition "Great Moravia" in Prague, 1964, and its Guidebook.

<sup>69</sup> Cf. S. Rittig, *Povijest i pravo slovenštine u crkvenom bogoslužju sa osobitim obzirom na Hrvatsku*, I (Zagreb, 1910).

<sup>70</sup> The author of the "Life of Methodius" was well acquainted with Latin texts. The "Life of Constantine," however, has a more Byzantine character.

<sup>71</sup> It must be added that it is difficult to understand why many scholars, on the one hand, recognize the greatness of the Byzantine mission and the importance of Byzantine culture for the origin and initial development of Slavic literary culture but, on the other hand, withhold full acknowledgement of Byzantium's role in, and importance for European and, especially, Slavic culture.

in the church of S. Maria Maggiore, and it is more logical to think that the translation of the liturgy into Slavonic was among these books.

Taking all of the above into consideration, I am inclined to believe that the two brothers did bring the Byzantine liturgy to Moravia.<sup>72</sup> After all, in my opinion at least, they were both Greeks, they thought like Greeks, and they were staunch patriots.<sup>73</sup> They spoke of the Byzantine Emperor and their Patriarch always with great respect. On the other hand, the complex of liturgical books translated into Slavonic was, as we have seen, Byzantine. The *Euchologium* of Sinai indicates that the liturgy was that of St. John Chrysostom. Only later, when Methodius and his disciples saw that the use of this liturgy was the subject of controversy, was a Roman Mass formula chosen and translated. Most probably it was the sacramentary now preserved as Codex D 47 in Padua. The Slavonic translation is preserved with some changes and additions in the Leaflets of Kiev. This, however, does not exclude the possibility that the Leaflets are a copy of an older manuscript, perhaps from the Moravian period.<sup>74</sup>

The question arises as to whether we may suppose that the liturgy was already celebrated in Slavonic during Constantine's stay in Moravia. It cannot be proved with the evidence we have, but it is possible, if not probable; for, if Constantine did not intend to use the Byzantine liturgical books in the divine service, why was he so anxious to translate them?

It is not easy to say how long this supposed use of the Byzantine liturgy lasted in Moravia. The change to the Roman liturgy could have been effected before the visit of the brothers to Venice and Rome, or after the consecration of Methodius as archbishop of Sirmium with jurisdiction over Pannonia and Moravia. If we regard the Kievan Leaflets as a Czech product, then, of course, the use of a Roman sacramentary would be easily explained. In any case, we must reject the opinion voiced recently by Dutthieul that the Kievan Leaflets are merely a sketch of a liturgical project, made by Constantine, to be further elaborated later.<sup>75</sup>

One may ask whether, during the Great Moravian period and later, the whole, or only certain parts, of the Mass was said in Slavonic. We do not know which practice was followed. In Dalmatia, where the Slavonic liturgy of the Roman rite had survived, the following procedure was adopted: the priest recited in Slavonic only those parts of the Mass that were to be said aloud or sung by the congregation.<sup>76</sup> The rest of the Mass liturgy was recited in Latin.

<sup>72</sup> I do not doubt that the passage in the legend (that priests from Italy, Germany, and Greece were active in Great Moravia before the arrival of the Byzantine mission) refers to Byzantine priests and monks. Why should this assertion always be minimized? Why should we not believe that Byzantine priests were active there if we recognize the validity of the information about the activity of priests from Germany and Italy? The mention of Greece in the legend could only have meant Byzantium. Rostislav, too, mentions that good laws, etc. always originated in Byzantium. Its influence was, therefore, certainly great.

<sup>73</sup> Cf. the allusions in the legends (about the lives of Constantine and Methodius) to the Emperor Michael III and others.

<sup>74</sup> The question as to whether the Kiev Leaflets could have originated from the late Moravian, i.e., the Methodius period, is not to be excluded, but cannot be proven either.

<sup>75</sup> Cf. P. Dutthieul, *op. cit.*, p. 111.

<sup>76</sup> Cf. J. Smržík, *op. cit.*, p. 109ff.

In the later period, especially from the seventeenth century on, the whole Mass was recited in Slavonic. We cannot determine which practice was followed in Moravia and Bohemia. It seems probable that the whole office of the Mass was recited in Slavonic, but whether this custom was introduced all at once or gradually is not known.

What about the dispensation of sacraments and other liturgical services? Here the *Euchologium Sinaiticum* may be of some help in answering the question. As we have seen, a great number of prayers prescribed for the dispensation of sacraments and liturgical acts are written in Old Church Slavonic which indicates that they were already translated from the Greek during the Moravian period. The vocabulary of other prayers points rather to a post-Moravian era. This shows that the two brothers intended to translate the whole Greek *Euchologium*, but first adapted the prayers and services which they thought most important. Their work was completed by their disciples after the destruction of Great Moravia. I would like to stress once more, in this connection, that parts of the *Euchologium* are very ancient, more ancient than the Leaflets of Kiev and the Fragments from Prague. I would compare the linguistic character of this part of the *Euchologium* with that of the Psalter of Sinai, of the Gospels, and also of the Acts of the Apostles, the translations of which were made by the two brothers.<sup>77</sup>

The problem concerning the penetration of the Slavonic liturgy into Poland, and among the Sorbians in modern Saxony, is still debated by the specialists. The Polish Slavist Lehr-Spławiński rejects the idea that the Slavonic liturgy was used in Poland.<sup>78</sup> The Czech Slavist Havránek and others defend the thesis that the Slavonic liturgy was in use also in Poland. Havránek found in the Polish religious terminology some words which recall Old Church Slavonic terms. Moreover, the first Polish religious hymn, Bogurodzica, seems to show the influence of a Byzantine hymnology and atmosphere, as well as the influence of the first Czech hymn, "Hospodine, pomiluj ny," in which Professor Jakobson has detected Byzantine elements.<sup>79</sup>

In my opinion the Slavonic liturgy did penetrate into Poland, though it is difficult to say whether it had already done so during the Moravian period. This may have been the case, but it is also possible that the penetration took place in the later period, from Bohemia. Some specialists speak of Slavonic bishoprics in Poland, in the region of Cracow, but that there were such can hardly be proved, at least not for the Great Moravian period.

The Czech specialist of the Sorbian language, Professor Frinta,<sup>80</sup> has shown

<sup>77</sup> Cf. J. Frček, *op. cit.*, p. 625 ff.

<sup>78</sup> Cf. K. Lanckorońska, "Le vestigia del rito Cirillo-Metodiano in Polonia," *Antemurale*, I (Rome, 1954); *idem*, "Studies on the Roman-Slavonic Rite in Poland," *Orient. Christ. Anal.*, 161 (Rome, 1961); cf. also B. Havránek, "Otázka existence cirkevní slovanštiny v Polsku," *Slavia*, XXV (1956), pp. 300-05; T. Lehr-Spławiński, "Czy są ślady istnienia liturgii cyrylo-metodejskiej w dawnej Polsce," *ibid.* pp. 290-9; *idem*, "Pierwszy chrzest Polski," *ibid.*, XXIX (1960), pp. 341-9.

<sup>79</sup> Cf. R. Jakobson, *Nejstarší české písne duchovní* (Prague, 1929), and his other studies on this question.

<sup>80</sup> Cf. A. Frinta, "Bohemismy a paleoslovenismy v lužickosrbské terminologii křest'anské a jejich dějepisný význam," *Acta Univ. Carolinæ* (1954), no. 5 (Philologica), p. 43.

that the religious terminology of Sorbian is closely akin to the Czech terminology, which was based, at least to a certain extent, on the Old Church Slavonic terminology. This seems to indicate that the Slavonic liturgy also reached the Slavs in modern Saxony, most probably from Bohemia, in the post-Moravian period. We cannot say how long this influence lasted.

It should be emphasized that the translation of the liturgical books into Slavonic was not only important for the religious development of the Slavs, but was, at the same time, a great cultural and literary achievement. It has been shown already that, after Constantine had composed an alphabet for the Slavs, a feverish literary activity started among them. There was a tendency to translate all important contemporary, mostly Byzantine, texts into Slavonic. This is characteristic, not only of the oldest Moravian period, but also of the whole early Middle Ages. The disciples of the two brothers continued their work, supplying translations of texts in the same spirit which had animated their masters. This tendency to provide translations of all important Byzantine texts strengthens the supposition that all liturgical texts were Slavicized. They are an integral part of Old Slavonic literature.

Even the translation of the liturgical texts is more than just a translation. We detect many passages in these texts which show that the authors adapted the Greek originals to the new environment in which they worked and to the spirit of the Slavonic language. This is particularly evident in the *Euchologium*, but it can be detected also in the Kievan Leaflets and in other documents.

The liturgical texts disclose also the fact that the new literary language was adequate for the enormous task of expressing Greek theological and philosophical terminology in terms which would conform to the spirit and the structure of the new literary idiom. The liturgical texts presented the greatest difficulty for the translators. They were composed in poetic language, often according to a metrical system. It was especially difficult to translate the religious songs in a manner which would appeal to the faithful who would be present at the services, but we are justified in saying that the translators achieved this. So far, the poetic side of these Slavonic texts has been neglected by Slavic philologists. Professor Jakobson is the first specialist to draw our attention to this fact in his studies of Old Slavonic religious songs. The success which the Slavonic liturgy had among the Slavs bears witness to the translators having fulfilled their task well.

In conclusion, I should like to summarize the results of this investigation as follows:

1. All Slavonic liturgical texts need more thorough analysis concerning their manuscript tradition and linguistic structure, especially the *Euchologium Sinaiticum*. Only when this analysis is completed shall we be able to determine which of these texts originated in the Moravian period.

2. The problem of the authorship of the Kievan Leaflets containing the translation of a Roman sacramentary must be subjected to more critical study. The fact that the Leaflets contain words which we also read in the translation of the Gospels does not prove definitely that they were translated by Constantine.

3. It seems clear that Constantine and Methodius were the first to introduce the Slavonic language into the Byzantine liturgy, and most probably into that of St. John Chrysostom.

4. The Gregorian sacramentary from Padua, which may be the basis of the Greek liturgy of St. Peter, was translated and introduced into the liturgy at a later date, probably still in Moravia or Bohemia.

5. A Western liturgy may well have existed in Moravia before the advent of the two brothers. It is difficult to say which kind of sacramentary was used by the German and other missionaries. It is also not clear whether a Byzantine liturgy was also in use, even if we accept the affirmation of the *Vita Methodii* that priests from Greece were working in Moravia. We cannot determine which Byzantine liturgy could have been brought by them, that of St. Basil or that of St. John Chrysostom.

6. If a Czech origin of the Kievan Leaflets should be demonstrated, then the question as to how the liturgy of St. Peter reached Bohemia would arise.

7. It is possible, but not certain, that the Slavonic language was introduced into the Mass gradually. In the administering of the sacraments, and in other liturgical functions, Slavonic was used. This is shown quite clearly in the oldest part of the *Euchologium* of Sinai.

8. It seems most probable that the Slavonic liturgy penetrated also into Poland, but it has not yet been established whether this happened during the Moravian period or after the destruction of the Moravian empire.

9. The Slavonic liturgy is a major contribution to Slavic culture. Its poetic and clear language continued to inspire Slavic poetry and literature for many centuries.